

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7                   WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
8                   AT SEATTLE

9  
10               UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
11    Plaintiff,  
12               v.  
13               AMANDA MCINTYRE,  
14    Defendant.

15    Case No. CR15-006RSL

16  
17    ORDER DENYING MOTION  
18    FOR TERMINATION OF  
19    SUPERVISED RELEASE

20  
21               This matter comes before the Court on defendant's "Motion for Termination of  
22               Supervised Release." Dkt. # 6. Having reviewed defendant's memorandum and exhibits, the  
23               input from United States Probation, and the remainder of the record, the Court DENIES  
24               defendant's motion.

25               On September 17, 2010, defendant pleaded guilty to one count of distribution of five or  
26               more grams of methamphetamine. Dkt. # 4. Defendant was sentenced by the Hon. Justin  
27               Quackenbush in the Eastern District of Washington to 71 months imprisonment followed by ten  
28               years of supervised release. *Id.*

1 After being released from prison in January 2014, defendant began her term of  
2 supervision in July of that year. Her supervised release term was transferred to this district.  
3 Since her release, defendant has lived with her sister, with whom she has a positive relationship.  
4 Defendant has stayed sober, and she has also worked to become a licensed esthetician.

5       The Court may terminate a period of supervised release after one year “if it is satisfied  
6 that such action is warranted by the conduct of the defendant released and the interest of  
7 justice.” 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(1). When deciding whether to terminate supervised release, the  
8 Court “enjoys discretion to consider a wide range of circumstances.” United States v. Emmett,  
9 749 F.3d 817, 819 (9th Cir. 2014).<sup>1</sup>

10      The Court finds that termination of supervised release is not warranted at this time. The  
11 United States Probation Office cites concerns with defendant’s lack of financial stability and her  
12 lack of support beyond her family, and the Court agrees. The Court commends defendant for all  
13 of her progress and encourages her to continue taking positive steps in her life while she remains  
14 under supervision.

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22      For all of the foregoing reasons, defendant’s motion is DENIED.

23  
24      

---

<sup>1</sup> In making this determination, the Court considers the following: the nature and circumstances of the  
25 offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant; the need for the sentence imposed to afford  
26 adequate deterrence, to protect the public, and to provide the defendant with needed training, medical  
27 care, or other treatment in the most effective manner; relevant guidelines or policy statements issued by  
28 the Sentencing Commission; the need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among similarly  
situated defendants; and the need to provide restitution to any victims. 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e); id.  
§ 3553(a).

DATED this 27<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2017.

  
Robert S. Lasnik  
United States District Judge